

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, and the rejection of claims 1-9 and 11-20 are respectfully requested. Applicant has attempted to address every objection and ground for rejection in the Office Action dated December 18, 2002 (Paper No. 10) and believes the application is now in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8, 11, 13-16 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bass et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,959,641). In response, Applicant traverses the rejection because the cited reference does not disclose (or suggest) a separate masking means which comprises a planar array of vertical opaque strips interposed between a raw image and a focal plane in order to create a masking effect for blocking light from the raw image to facilitate the separation of left hand and right hand images by an observer.

Bass et al. disclose a stereoscopic viewing system that includes a raw image of interleaved raw image strips and a lenticular screen. In one embodiment, each of the lenticles in the lenticular screen has four light sources in alignment. With regard to each of the lenticles, Bass et al. recite in column 6, lns. 10-12 "It is believed that the lenticle has the effect of masking all but one member of the set of light sources for each eye." However, Bass et al. do not disclose or suggest a separate masking means comprising a planar array of vertical opaque strips interposed between the raw image and the focal plane in order to create the masking effect for blocking light from the raw image to facilitate the separation of left hand and right hand images by an observer. Rather, Bass et al. disclose a lenticular screen 3 composed of parallel cylindrical lens elements or lenticles 5 that each have a curved outer surface (see column 3, lns. 6-9).

In contrast, the present invention is directed to a stereoscopic viewing system having a raw image comprising an array of substantially vertical raw image strips where alternating strips are respectfully taken from a right eye view image and a left eye view image of a subject, an array of substantially vertical lens strips interposed between the raw image and a focal plane spaced from the raw image, and a masking means. The masking mean comprises a substantially planar array of vertical opaque strips interposed between the raw image and the focal plane. Since the cited reference does not disclose a masking means comprising a substantially planar array of vertical opaque strips interposed between the raw image and the focal plane, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection to claim 1. Claims 2-3, 5-6, 8, 11, 13-16, and 19 are dependent either directly or indirectly from independent claim 1, and are considered allowable based on their chain of dependency. Withdrawal of the rejection to these claims is also respectfully requested.

Claims 4 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Bass et al., in view of Goldsmith (U.S. Patent No. 3,674,921). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Since claims 4 and 12 ultimately depend upon claim 1, they necessarily include all of the features of their associate independent claim plus other additional features. Thus, Applicant submits that the §103 rejection of claims 4 and 12 have also been overcome for the same reasons mentioned above to overcome the rejection of independent claim 1.

In addition, Goldsmith describes a three-dimensional television system including a lenticular lens array on an inside surface of a picture tube. In one embodiment shown in figure 6, the individual lenticulations are separated by a small

opaque strip. However, this opaque strip is believed to effectively prevent an observer from viewing an adjacent column of luminescent screen components through an individual lenticulation. The opaque strips disclosed in Goldsmith separate the lenticulations from each other, and prevent light from being projected and viewed by an observer through multiple lenticulations. In contrast, the masking means of the present invention masks portions of the raw image from the observer, rather than preventing light from being transmitted through one lenticulation to another. That is, Applicant believes that Goldsmith does not disclose or suggest having opaque strips to block light from the raw image and facilitate separation of left hand and right hand images. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claims 4 and 12 be withdrawn.

Claims 7, 9, 17-18 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Bass et al., in view of Yoshida et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,066,099). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Since claims 7, 9, 17-18 and 20 ultimately depend upon claim 1, they necessarily include all of the features of their associate independent claim plus additional features. Thus, Applicant submits that the §103 rejection of claims 7, 9, 17-18 and 20 have also been overcome for the same reasons mentioned above to overcome the rejection of independent claim 1.

In addition, Yoshida et al. disclose a screen for a rear projection monitor. A sheet member comprising an array of lenticular lenses is also disclosed. The boundary portions between the lenticular lenses include flat surfaces upon which are provided a light absorbing layer. The light absorbing layer appears on a screen as an array of parallel black straight lines, which are intended to reduce reflection of ambient light to enhance a contrast of images projected on the screen. Yoshida et al. do not disclose or

suggest a masking means that is interposed between a raw image and comprises an array of alternating strips respectfully taken from a right hand view image and a left hand view image of a subject and a focal plane in order to block light from the raw image reaching an eye of an observer to facilitate separation of left hand and right hand images. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claims 7, 9, 17-18 and 20 be withdrawn.

Applicant submits in view of the above remarks, the claims in their present form are patentably distinct over the art of record. Allowance of the rejected claims is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner discover there are remaining issues which may be resolved by a telephone interview, he is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By



Joseph P. Fox

Registration No. 41,760

June 17, 2003

300 South Wacker Drive, Suite 2500

Chicago, Illinois 60606

Telephone: (312) 360-0080

Facsimile: (312) 360-9315

Customer No. 24978

K:\0303\63605\Response A.doc